

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

RANDALL STEVENS,

Plaintiff,

v.

PIERCE COUNTY, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C22-5862 BHS

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Randall Stevens' unopposed Motion to Amend. Dkt. 14.

Leave to amend a complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a) "shall be freely given when justice so requires." *Carvalho v. Equifax Info. Servs., LLC*, 629 F.3d 876, 892 (9th Cir. 2010). "This policy is 'to be applied with extreme liberality.'" *Eminence Cap., LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048, 1051 (9th Cir. 2003) (quoting *Owens v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc.*, 244 F.3d 708, 712 (9th Cir. 2001)). In determining whether to grant leave under Rule 15, courts consider five factors: "bad faith, undue delay, prejudice to the opposing party, futility of amendment, and whether the plaintiff has previously amended the complaint." *United States v. Corinthian Colls.*,

1 655 F.3d 984, 995 (9th Cir. 2011). Among these factors, prejudice to the opposing party
2 carries the greatest weight. *Eminence Cap.*, 316 F.3d at 1052.

3 Stevens' motion is unopposed, Dkt. 15, and the Court concludes that granting
4 leave to amend is warranted. His Motion to Amend, Dkt. 14, is therefore **GRANTED**.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated this 3rd day of April, 2023.

7
8 

9 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22